

CONCLUSIONS.

My general conclusions are :

1. That there is no evidence of a prehistoric, non-Eurafrican race in western Asia. Its soil has always been possessed either by the Caucasian, the Semitic or the Aryan branches of the White race.

2. There are distinct signs that the Caucasian stock in prehistoric times extended over large areas south of their present homes, and were driven north by the attacks of the Aryans and Semites.

3. The chains of the Amanus on the west, the Masius on the north and the Zagros on the east have been from immemorial eras the limits of durable ethnic impressions by the Semites.

4. From the Zagros to the Pamir, the Aryan stock occupied or controlled the land at the dawn of history. Medes and Proto-Medes were alike Aryans.

5. The civilization of Babylonia arose from some branch or blend of the White race, and not from any tribe of the Asian or Yellow race, still less from the Dravidian or Black races.

6. The Anatolian group of Asia Minor were allied to the Gallo-Celtic tribes of central Europe, and preceded by probably several millenniums the Hellenic migrations into Asia.

*Biographical Sketch of the Hon. Thomas H. Dudley, of Camden, N. J.,
who Died April 15, 1893.*

By William John Potts.

(Read before the American Philosophical Society, April 19, 1895.)

Thomas Haines Dudley, born 10th mo. 9, 1819, died 4th mo. 15, 1893, elected a member of the American Philosophical Society 10th mo. 15, 1880, was descended from Francis Dudley and Rachel Wilkins, his wife, a member of the Society of Friends who came from the Parish of St. Peter, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire, about 1730. Francis Dudley was the son of John Dudley and Mary Arney, of that parish, who were married in 1708. Another account says the name of his mother was Jane Dudley. John, the English ancestor of this New Jersey family of Dudley, died in 1746. In the parish register of St. Peter's he is named as "singing man and clerk."

Francis Dudley, the eldest son, so tradition says, came over with Nathan Middleton, and shortly after married Rachel Wilkins in 1733, settled at Evesham (the "Vale of Evesham," as the early settlers called it in memory of their old home in England), Burlington county, N. J. This progenitor of the name in this State died in the early part of 1782 at Evesham. We find his will on record in the Secretary of State's office at Trenton, and that of his widow Rachel a few years later, in 1786. He leaves his three sons goodly farms, upon the metes and bounds of which he dwells minutely with all the pride of a Saxon landholder. In this connection we are reminded of the eloquent words of Mr. Blaine in his oration on President Garfield, which are equally applicable to Mr. Dudley. Mr. Blaine says he "was born heir to land, to the title of freeholder, which has been the patent and passport of self-respect with the Anglo-Saxon race ever since Hengist and Horsa landed on the shores of England."

Thomas Dudley, son of Francis, married Martha Evans, 11th mo. 27, 1762, of an old and respectable family among Friends. They had ten children. Evan Dudley was the ninth child; he was born 1st mo. 1, 1783, married Ann Haines and died 3rd mo. 21, 1820, aged thirty-seven years.*

Thomas Haines Dudley, the subject of this biography, was the youngest child of this marriage. His early youth was passed in Burlington county, where he was born, working upon his mother's farm. She was early left a widow with four children. She was a descendant of Richard Haines, of Aynhoe, Northamptonshire, whose children came to Burlington county, N. J., in 1683; thus we see Mr. Dudley had a claim to early American ancestry on both sides of his family. For some years he taught school in the vicinity and saved sufficient money to begin the study of law under William N. Jeffers, a lawyer of good standing in Camden. During this period, while he was returning from a night school late in the evening, an incident happened which we have often heard him relate without any thought of our application of it to himself. It showed the same determination and courage which was the ruling trait of his life and the cause of his success. Passing at twelve o'clock at night over a lonely road by a graveyard, he saw in the grounds what seemed to him, the more he gazed upon it, to be the figure of a human being in white, moving and bending toward him. Though so frightened that his teeth chattered and his knees fairly knocked together, he determined to go forward and examine it. Climbing the fence, he was strongly tempted to go back; he shook with fright, the thing seemed so supernatural in the moonlight, but reasoning strongly within himself, "there is no such thing as a ghost," he determined to push on, and conquering all his fears, pressed forward and found that the weird figure was a sheep with its horns caught in the bushes, moving up and down in its efforts to get free.

* We are indebted to Miss Henrietta Haines, of Moorestown, N. J., and to Miss Martha Evans Bellangee, of Asbury Park, N. J., for valuable genealogical data, and regret that limited space does not permit us to give other details.

Between fifty and sixty years ago there was more belief in ghosts than now, and when we consider Mr. Dudley was then a young man, brought up in an atmosphere in which this belief was not uncommon, the circumstance was one that few—alone at such an hour in the middle of the night, in a lonely country graveyard—very few, indeed, would have stopped to investigate. His description was much more graphic and awe-inspiring than we can give, and was related to the writer as an instance that we must not be influenced by groundless fears in what reason tells us is untrue.

Among Mr. Dudley's papers is a draft of a short article by him, signed "Many Citizens," probably one of his first political efforts. It was published in the *United States Gazette* during the year 1842. This concerns the removal of Judge Philip J. Gray from the office of Surveyor of the Port of Camden. He was a man of character, highly respected, and was afterwards reinstated by Zachary Taylor. President John Tyler is taken to task for this removal as being inconsistent with the views expressed in his inaugural address to the people of the United States, April 9, 1841, where he says, "I will remove no incumbent from office who has faithfully and honestly acquitted himself of the duties of his office, except in such cases where such officer has been guilty of an active partisanship, or by secret means, the less manly and therefore the more objectionable, has given his official influence to the purposes of party, thereby bringing the patronage of the Government in conflict with the freedom of elections."

In 1843 Mr. Dudley held the two offices of City Clerk and City Treasurer of Camden when aged twenty-three.

When twenty-four years of age we find him taking an active part in the Clay campaign as Secretary of the Clay Club of Camden: August 29, 1844, drawing up the minutes of the District Clay Club Convention, held at Bridgeton at that date, as its Secretary; Dr. Ephraim Buck, President, associated with men some of whom were to become famous in the State, namely, Abraham Browning, A. G. Cattell, Dr. E. Q. Keasbey, Charles P. Elmer and others.

Among his papers is a rough drawing of a "Clay Cabin," a curiosity to the present generation. It was located at Fourth and Market streets, Camden, and these few details are worthy of being recorded for the history of politics in this vicinity in what was a very exciting campaign. This "cabin" of those primitive political days of half a century ago was "46 feet deep and 25 feet front" with, of course, a flagpole, made in the early part of the year 1844 for the Camden Clay Club. The building came to a little more than the contract, costing in all \$155 "32 benches at 50 cts. pr. peas," the carpenter's bill calls for, which gives an idea of Clay's political following in the neighborhood. Allowing five persons to a bench, we may conclude "the cabin" held 160 persons. Mr. Dudley seems to have been active in all of this organization. A good speech of his, made on the occasion of a flag presentation to this organization, has been preserved. It will be remembered he was then but twenty-four,

and at that youthful age he takes strong ground for the protection of American industry. His first child, who died in infancy, was named for Henry Clay. This was the early school of one who was afterward to have a much more enlarged sphere.

With his hard-earned savings and the money he had obtained by mortgaging his farm to study law, he at last passed his examination in 1845, and having been admitted, retired to his room at his boarding house in Camden, shut the door, threw himself on the bed greatly depressed, wondering where his bread was to come from without a single client, when there came a knock on the door and a client appeared in the person of Mr. Benjamin Cooper, of Camden county, engaging him for a case of which there were perhaps few men able or willing to undertake, from its difficulty and danger, in which all the instincts of humanity required a speedy action. A free colored family of Burlington county, personally known to Mr. Dudley, had been kidnapped into slavery, a mother and three children, and had been rapidly driven away on the road South. Members of the Society of Friends of Burlington county hastily met together and subscribed, it is said, a thousand dollars to buy back the woman and her children. The difficulty then arose, who was to pursue the fleeing kidnappers and their victims and redeem the captives, a most dangerous task in those days for a Northerner to venture across the border on such an errand of mercy and of justice.

Mr. Cooper informed his coadjutors that he knew such a man, who had just passed the bar, whose sympathies were with the Abolitionists, and, above all, possessed the energy and determination necessary; who knew, besides, the captives, as the woman had often worked on his mother's farm when he was a child. Disguising himself in the character of a slave trader, who were often Northern men from the borders, Mr. Dudley procured a large broad-brimmed hat, a whip, and taking a pair of pistols he followed the track of the fugitives and was so fortunate as to discover them near the Head of Elk, in Maryland. He gave out that he was from a distant part of the country buying slaves to take South. The sale was not accomplished without its dangers, for presuming he must have a large sum of money with him, he overheard a plot to rob him, and sat up all night in the hotel with his pistols before him on the table. Keeping up the character of a slave trader, he had behaved so roughly to the woman and her child that they did not recognize him and took him for what he pretended to be. He ordered them to be locked up safely until he could take them away in the morning. The poor woman, overcome with fear, reluctantly followed. Making a detour south to deceive the kidnappers, it was not until on the boat at Wilmington, Del., that he asked the poor creature if she did not know him, and received for a reply, "All she wanted to." Her fears turned to joy when he said, "Don't you remember Nancy Dudley's little boy, Tom, who used to play pranks on the cows you milked at Evesham and make them kick the pail over?" And when he told her she was going home, her happiness can be imagined.

We give below a copy of the deed of sale,* with a feeling of earnest thankfulness that a bill for a slave is no longer a possibility in this country. Of the other children, a boy and a girl, it is said the boy was advertised for sale in Baltimore, and was bought by Mr. Dudley for ninety dollars, before the sale came off. The girl was purchased by a lady in Baltimore.

The West Jersey Mail, a weekly paper of Camden, records his marriage in its issue of Wednesday, March 11, 1846, as follows: "In this city, on fourth day evening last, 4 inst. by Friends' ceremony, Thomas H. Dudley to Emmaline, daughter of Seth Matlack."

She was a faithful and devoted wife, the mother of three children, who survived infancy—Edward, Mary, and Ellen. Mrs. Dudley died at Madrid, Spain, February 9, 1884, regretted by all who knew her as a woman of a happy disposition and kindness of heart, with many qualities serviceable to her husband in his career.

In July, 1848, he was admitted a counselor-at-law. While practicing law and engaging in politics his acquaintance began with such men as the late Henry C. Carey, David Davis (afterwards Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States), Judge Ephraim Marsh, and others active in political life, which acquaintance ripened into friendship and lasted to the end of their lives.

In the beginning of the decade of 1850 we find among his correspondence, numerous letters in the minute hand of the eminent writer on the tariff, Mr. Carey, above mentioned, largely upon this subject, of whom he was an apt pupil.

In 1851 he was elected City Treasurer of Camden, and in the years 1856 and 1857, City Solicitor; in 1856, Chairman of the Republican State Executive Committee of New Jersey.

Mr. Dudley was one of the number of those saved in the burning of the ferryboat *New Jersey* on Saturday evening, March 15, 1856. This calamity was one of the most terrible which had ever occurred in this vicinity. It was brought prominently before the inhabitants of the two cities, Camden and Philadelphia, by the drifting of the steamboat in flames, in full view of thousands of spectators from both sides of the river, who could see the unfortunate passengers when near Philadelphia

* Know All Men by These Presents that I, William E. Chance of the county of Caroline, State of Maryland, for the consideration of one hundred and fifty dollars current money, to me in hand paid by Thomas H. Dudley of the State of New Jersey, the receipt whereof I hereby acknowledge, have granted, bargained, sold, aliened, and delivered, and by these presents do grant, bargain, sell, and deliver unto the said Thomas H. Dudley my negro slave Maria Johnson and her child Susan about 16 months old, which said slaves Maria and Susan I will warrant and defend to the said Thomas H. Dudley, his executors and administrators and assigns against me, my executors and administrators and against every other person or persons whatsoever. In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set my name and affirmed my seal this eighteenth day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-five.

In the presence of
I. M. BERNARD.

} Signed, WILLIAM E. CHANCE. (Seal)

leap one by one into the water, driven over by the fire, and could distinctly hear their cries. The solemn sound of the State House bell, the ringing of the firebells in both cities, and the lurid glare which lighted up the Delaware, added to the horrible scene, of which the writer was one of the eye-witnesses from the Camden shore. The pilot box was the first part of the vessel to catch, and consequently the boat soon became unmanageable. Loaded with heavy wagons and a hundred passengers returning to their homes in Camden, nearly fifty persons, it is said, were lost. Finally driven by the flames, Mr. Dudley, throwing away his overcoat to sink more easily and avoid the paddle-wheels which struck many, sprang as far as possible from the side of the vessel, and came up in a mass of crushed ice, which gave but a partial support. It was in this situation that he saw many leap into the water, their clothes on fire and their cries most agonizing—a scene which naturally had an effect upon his nervous system, and one never to be forgotten, of which he rarely ever spoke. Shouting until his cries grew faint, he was despairing and overcome with cold, when several men in a boat which put out from the Philadelphia side, rescued him, and he was carried in a state of apparent death to the hotel at Arch street wharf, where all efforts to bring him to life seemed in vain. Mr. Albert S. Markley, of Camden, a well-known director in the Camden & Amboy Railroad, happening in, recognized him, and after long and persistent efforts, though told it was no use, the man was dead, restored him to consciousness. Mr. Dudley was then in his thirty-sixth year.

In 1860 he was Chairman of the State Executive Committee of New Jersey.

“In 1860 he was chosen as one of the Senatorial delegates from the State at large, in the memorable convention at Chicago, which nominated Abraham Lincoln for President. He was a member of the committee which framed the platform adopted by that convention, and it was he who introduced the plank favoring incidental protection to American manufactures and was mainly instrumental in carrying it through the convention. He supported Mr. Lincoln as a candidate for nomination, in opposition to Mr. Seward, and took a prominent part in bringing about that nomination.

“The manner in which this nomination was effected, and Mr. Dudley’s part therein, is thus related by Charles P. Smith in *Beecher’s* (Trenton) *Magazine*. As these are facts of historic interest, we give the account in full.” [We shall introduce Mr. Smith’s account by a few words from Mr. Isaac H. Bromley’s striking and vivid paper, with the same title, in *Scribner’s Magazine* for November, 1893, a spectator as a journalist in the scenes which he describes. He was afterward one of the editors of the *New York Tribune*. Mr. Bromley says, “The Chicago Convention of 1860 was much more than an organized body of delegates, its work much more than that of nominating candidates. Its transactions overshadowed in importance, outreached in consequences, and transcended in results those of any assembly of men that was ever gathered on this con-

tinent. I shall not stop to answer the reader's rising thought of Philadelphia and 1776." This is strong language, but Mr. Bromley impresses the reader with its truth. Both narratives, though widely different in their style, deserve a place in the history of this important occasion.]

“THE NOMINATION OF LINCOLN.

“As a member of the ‘Opposition State Executive Committee’ I signed a call for a State Convention in Trenton, on March 8, 1860, for the purpose of selecting delegates to the National Convention at Chicago. At that period there was a respectable and extremely active portion of the party in East Jersey in favor of nominating Mr. Seward for the Presidency and seeking to secure for him the vote of this State in convention. Aside from the Presidential question, it was highly important that we achieve success in our own State, and this, I felt confident, could not be accomplished with Mr. Seward as our Presidential candidate. It occurred to me that our proper course would be to hold the vote of the State on Mr. Dayton, and possibly give him the nomination. At all events, it might at least aid in nominating a candidate with whom success in this State was possible. Mr. Thomas H. Dudley came into the Supreme Court office one day on professional business, and I called his attention to what I deemed the unfortunate tendency of affairs. He coincided with me in opinion, but argued that the loss of the State under the circumstances was unavoidable—at least he perceived no recourse. I suggested that we start a candidate in our own State, to hold the vote, and named the Hon. William L. Dayton. Mr. Dudley, after some consideration, assented. I then advised holding a caucus of leading men of the party to give force to the movement, whereupon Mr. Dudley agreed to notify such gentlemen in the First Congressional District as he might deem proper and I was to summon from the State at large. We thus assembled some sixty prominent Jersey men at Jones’ Hotel, Chestnut street, Philadelphia. I also spent considerable time in securing the attendance of a number of active Philadelphia Republican politicians. My object was to induce them to join in the movement; but they preferred Mr. Cameron. As far as their coöperation was concerned, the movement was without success. Abraham Browning, Esq., of Camden, presided at the meeting, and after considerable discussion, in which Mr. Dudley took by far the most prominent part, the Jersey men present unanimously determined to use their best efforts to secure delegates in favor of Mr. Dayton. The effect of this meeting was fully manifested in the State Convention. But a small moiety of the East Jersey delegates were for Mr. Seward, while the large majority were decidedly for Mr. Dayton. Mr. Dudley was selected as a delegate from the First District, and at Chicago was one of the most prominent and active members of the New Jersey delegation, exercising all necessary influence in holding the vote of his State for Mr. Dayton until he was able to cast it for Mr. Lincoln, and practically give him the nomination.

“It was conceded early in the session of the convention that there were four doubtful States—New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois and Pennsylvania—and it was necessary to carry at least two of these States in order to nominate a candidate other than Mr. Seward. New Jersey presented Mr. Dayton; Pennsylvania, Mr. Cameron; and Indiana and Illinois, Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Seward was the first choice of a majority of the New England States, but the event disclosed that they preferred the triumph of principle to the success of their favorite. A committee of these States, headed by Ex-Governor Andrew, waited upon the New Jersey delegation at their rooms, and declared that Mr. Seward was their choice, but if he could not carry the doubtful States they were willing to go for any one else who could, but added, ‘Gentlemen, you see our difficulty; you are not agreed among yourselves, but present three different candidates. Now, if you will unite upon some one man who can carry them, then we will give him enough votes in the convention to nominate him. If you continue divided we shall go into the convention and vote for Mr. Seward, our first choice.’ It was narrowed down to this; the four doubtful States must unite upon a candidate or Mr. Seward would be nominated. The convention assembled Wednesday morning, without change in this state of affairs. Mr. Dudley was assigned a place on the committee to frame a platform, and kept busy until Thursday noon. At that time the four doubtful States assembled at Cameron Hall to endeavor to unite upon some person. Ex-Governor Reeder presided. It was a noisy assemblage, and it very soon became evident that nothing could be accomplished as affairs then stood. Mr. Dudley then proposed to Mr. Judd, of Illinois, that the matter should be referred to a committee of three from each of the four States. He made a motion to this effect which was carried. Among those appointed were Judge David Davis, Caleb B. Smith, David Wilmot and William B. Mann, of Pennsylvania. On the part of New Jersey, Judge Ephraim Marsh, Hon. F. T. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Dudley. The committee met at six P.M. in Mr. Wilmot’s room and were in session until nearly ten P.M. before anything was accomplished. At that time it seemed that an adjournment would be carried without arriving at an understanding. The time had been consumed in talking and trying to persuade each other that their favorite candidates were the most available and best qualified. It was then that Mr. Greeley went to the door, and finding no agreement had been reached, telegraphed to the *Tribune* that Mr. Seward would certainly be nominated the next morning as the Republican candidate.

“Finding that the committee was about to separate without achieving any result, Mr. Dudley took the floor, and proposed that it should be ascertained which one of the three candidates had the greatest actual strength before the convention, and could carry the greatest number of delegates from the four States in the event of dropping the other two. Judge Davis stated as to Mr. Lincoln’s vote on the first ballot, and the probable vote of the Illinois delegates, in the event of Mr. Lincoln being

dropped—that is, how they would break. The committee from Indiana and Pennsylvania also reported how the votes of their States would be cast if Lincoln and Cameron were both dropped. The New Jersey committee made a similar statement as to the strength of Judge Dayton. It was understood that a portion of the New Jersey delegates would drop Mr. Dayton, after giving him a complimentary vote, and go for Mr. Seward.

“This examination revealed the fact that of the three candidates Mr. Lincoln was the strongest. Mr. Dudley then proposed to the Pennsylvania committee that for the general good and success of the party they should give up their candidates and unite upon Lincoln. After some discussion, Mr. Dudley’s proposition was agreed to, and a programme arranged to carry it into execution. A meeting of the Dayton delegates from New Jersey was immediately called at James T. Sherman’s room, at one o’clock that night; Judge Marsh and Mr. Frelinghuysen, evidently not believing it possible to carry out the plan, did not attend the meeting; thus Mr. Dudley was the only one from the committee present. He explained what had been accomplished, and, after talking the matter over, they approved his action. It was understood that Judge Dayton was to receive one or more complimentary votes, and then the strength of the delegation to be thrown for Mr. Lincoln. It was also arranged that Mr. Dudley was to lead off in voting for Mr. Lincoln, and then they were to follow. The Pennsylvania delegation likewise adopted the plan, first giving Mr. Cameron a complimentary vote. The agreement of the committee was not generally known when the convention assembled. On the first ballot the entire New Jersey delegation voted for Mr. Dayton; the next, that portion who favored Mr. Seward, voted for him, while the majority voted for Mr. Dayton. When New Jersey was called on the third ballot, Mr. Dudley stated that he should vote for Mr. Lincoln and was immediately followed by all the New Jersey delegates save one. The result is known. New England did what she promised, and Mr. Lincoln was nominated. It was the action of the committee from the four doubtful States which undoubtedly secured Mr. Lincoln’s nomination; but for this Mr. Seward would have been nominated, and there is little doubt, just as surely defeated. This is a plain narrative of the manner in which the nomination of Abraham Lincoln was brought about. It cannot be disguised that, had it not been for Mr. Dudley’s energy and tact in the committee of the doubtful States, the nation in the emergency which so soon followed would not have had the service of that great and good man at the helm.

“Mr. Lincoln recognized his obligations to Mr. Dayton’s friends by nominating that honored citizen to the important position of Minister to France. I wrote to Mr. Lincoln after his inauguration; stating fully Mr. Dudley’s action in the convention, and asking his appointment as Consul to Liverpool. Others likewise urged his claims, and he was appointed to the position, where his eminent services during the Rebellion were

scarcely inferior to those rendered by our Minister at the Court of St. James."

Early in 1861, before he had accepted the position of Consul to Liverpool, Mr. Dudley went abroad for his health. While there, he was appointed Consul to Paris, to fill the temporary vacancy, Mr. Bigelow not having yet arrived and the former incumbent having proved a Secessionist.

The trying situation of Mr. Dudley and the little band of American patriots in Liverpool is best described by Mr. William Everett in his address on Charles Francis Adams.* He says: "I was in England during the first two years of the war. I was one of that little company of Americans whose duty kept us in England, scattered, isolated, scantily informed, learning what was going on at home chiefly from garbled telegrams, not knowing what to believe, yet called to account for everything rash or foolish done or said to be done in North and South alike; sneered at, taunted, patronized and forced every hour to fight the battle of our country's honor as truly as you who were in the regiments at home. You had your trials; believe me, we had ours. You were five hundred thousand strong; we were scarcely a fair-sized regiment, and scattered farther apart than the pickets of a whole army corps. You had the nation at your very backs; we were cut off from it by ten days of ocean. You had those who took eager account of your triumphs and your disasters. We might bear tortures as acute as wounds or fever, and deal what blows we could, with none to note or sympathize. Yet there we fought, resolved that the name of America should not die in the land from which her founders came. And to him we looked as leader, as commander in our strife for honor; and none who fought under McClellan or Grant, under Dupont or Farragut, remember those heroes with more grateful devotion than that which we pay to the memory of Charles Francis Adams."

It is impossible to read Mr. Adams' letters in "The Diplomatic Correspondence" without having a profound respect for the character of the man and his diplomatic ability. Mr. Dudley's relations with Mr. Adams were constant and close. Surrounded by spies, a written correspondence was not always deemed safe, as every moment the Consul at Liverpool was watched and followed. For these reasons he often took the train for London from Edgehill, having previously arranged to have his family take his valise in their carriage and meet him there. He had noticed that if he carried a handbag a spy was sure to follow and take the same train, surmising his destination. If without it, apparently he was free from this espionage. The numerous letters from his friend, Mr. Benjamin Moran, the Secretary of Legation at London, were purposely written in such a vague way that if they were intercepted, they would be of no ser-

* William Everett's "Address on Charles Francis Adams," July 4, 1887, Cambridge, 1887, pp. 85, 86, 87.

vice to the rebel agents. Having examined a large number of them, we must give Mr. Moran credit for great ingenuity.

Liverpool, which owed its early rise and progress to the slave trade, was in a great variety of ways the stronghold of Southern sympathy. An instance is given in a letter of Mr. Seward to Charles Francis Adams in "The Diplomatic Correspondence."

"MAY 1, 1862.

"*Sir* :—Mr. Dudley our vigilant consul at Liverpool, writes that the subscription which was gotten up in that place to aid the insurrection in this country mounted up to £10,000 sterling, and that all that large sum of money has been invested in arms and munitions of war. He also states that a second subscription for the same purpose is now being filled up in the same place.

"I can hardly doubt that he has brought these facts to your notice and that you have called the attention of her Majesty's government to them."

The Consul received numerous threatening letters warning him unless he ceased his opposition to those who gave substantial assistance to the Confederate government, his life would be taken, and if found in certain designated spots he would be shot on sight. These threats had little effect on his determination to do his duty. It is pleasant to meet with an occasional friend of the Union, whose sympathy an American at such a crisis needed at this advanced outpost in what may truly be called the enemy's country. John Bright was such a one, whose letters of heartfelt sympathy we print below.* On one occasion we meet with the letter of an undecided friend from an anonymous source, who seems ashamed of

* The English friends of the Union in Liverpool were few, but hearty and practical in their sympathy. They deserve to be held in grateful remembrance. First we would mention the Vice-Consul of the United States, Mr. Henry Wilding, an able and efficient officer, himself an Englishman. He died a few years since. Charles Edward Rawlins, Ex-President of the Chamber of Commerce; Robert Trimble; James Spence, elsewhere mentioned in this article; Charles Wilson; William Inman, of the Inman Line Steamship Company; William Crossfield; Samuel Bulley; Thomas Avison, and the firm of Jevons & Ryley (Wm. A. Jevons, Thomas C. Ryley).

The American merchants who formed the Liverpool colony that were steadfast in their devotion to their country were Daniel James (of Phelps, Dodge & Co.), George Warren (founder of the Warren Steamship Company), Stephen B. Guion (head of the Guion Line), B. F. Babcock, William T. Whittimore and Henry Nash.

The Americans were in some sense in a state of siege, surrounded by their enemies. These earnest men brought private news of the success of the Union arms to the Consul and distributed correct information among the friends of the United States, sometimes in the middle of the night; otherwise all they would have known for at least two weeks were garbled telegrams and false reports. Among the English, the family of Mr. Robert Trimble, above mentioned, made with their own hands and the help of their friends eight hundred garments for the freedmen of the South. The determination of these few men, headed by Mr. Dudley, and the colony in London led by Mr. Adams was not without its influence being ultimately felt in England. John Bright's remarkable speeches were followed by the sympathy of some of the most profound thinkers in Great Britain.

the disgraceful piratical proceedings of his fellow-Englishmen, and sends the Consul the following picturesquely descriptive note :

“*Sir* :—There is a steamer called the *Kirang Tung* in the Birkenhead Dock sails built and Guns on board, said to be for the *Chinese* and ready to sail any tide ; she came from the same building yard as the *Alabama* and it may be worth your while to look after her. She has two masts, wholly or partially brig-rigged, two funnels painted light colour, black hull and light blue paddle boxes, built of iron with a ram bow . . . I don’t side particularly with North or South but

“I am

“NO PRIVATEER’S MAN.

“LIVERPOOL, 1 May, 1863.”

A few of Mr. Bright’s letters are marked “private,” but this the reader will readily see bears on the time and circumstance, which secrecy above thirty years’ distance removes. They all do him the highest honor, and show that his political course and some of his important speeches, which considerably influenced the English people of the liberal sort, were probably to some extent owing to Mr. Dudley’s efforts to keep him correctly informed.

“ROCHDALE, Dec. 29, 1861.

“*Dear Sir* :—I am very much obliged to you for your kind letter, and I shall be very happy if anything I have said shall contribute to the preservation of peace.

“There are two nations in England—the governing class and the millions who toil—the former dislike your republic, and their organs incessantly misrepresent and slander it—the latter have no ill feeling towards you, but are not altogether unaffected by the statements made to your prejudice. I hope however that out of present perils we may see a bright future and a better understanding between your people and ours.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

“LLANDUDNO, NORTH WALES, Oct. 18, ’62.

“*Dear Sir* :—I have ordered the Book of which you speak. I read Gasparin’s first Book and thought it admirable.

“I know nothing of Gladstone’s speech * except that on the American question it is discreditable to him, and calculated to do mischief. He comes of a family long connected with slavery—and is now the minister in a country where aristocracy rules, and by which a republic is neces-

*Mr. Adams wrote to Mr. Seward from London, October 17, 1862, regarding Mr. Gladstone’s speech in much the same manner.

Mr. Adams says later in his letter: “The general opinion now is that he was very indiscreet. But I see no change in the current [of public opinion]. Indeed nothing short of a very decisive victory in Virginia will avail to check it.”

sarily hated, and I suppose he takes the color of the atmosphere in which he moves.

“The Proclamation * is a grand move not too soon, nor too late, in my opinion. It must have a good effect here in putting your enemies more and more in the wrong.

“During the winter as your forces get possession of Charleston, Savannah, Mobile and Vicksburgh the negro will learn everywhere who are his friends, and I can see no way of escape for the Conspirators but in working the ‘Emancipation’ lever for themselves. If they declare for freedom, they may give you a deal of trouble—but if they do not I think their whole basis of industry and power will crumble under them.

“Don’t be unhappy about English opinion—there will be a reaction—and it is what you *do* in America, and not what people *think* here that will decide the contest.†

“You offered to write to Horace Greeley asking him to send me the *Tribune*. I shall be glad to pay for it if he has an agent in Liverpool.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOMAS H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

“ROCHDALE, Jany. 26, 1863.

“*Dear Sir* :—Thank you for the Book—I have read it through with much pleasure. I wish it may have a wide circulation in America and in England.

“You may rely upon it that positive sympathy with the South is only to be found in our ‘upper crust’ and the rich middle class which largely ‘flunkey’ to it. The People, the millions don’t hate America because of the republic—nor do they prefer the disruption of the Union to the abolition of slavery.

“I am sorry your Govt. has not yet succeeded in clearing the great river—they seem generally to underrate the work they have to do—to attempt too many things at once. The retaking of Galveston shows great carelessness on the part of those in authority in the Gulf.

“I hope and believe we shall not hear much of recognition and intervention in the coming session, unless circumstances change for the worse with you.

“The *Alabama* will be discussed in some shape. The Govt. feel themselves in a difficulty about it. I should like to have all the facts of the case, and an hour’s talk with you upon them before the meeting of Parl., but I don’t know whether such a thing can be arranged or not.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

* The Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Lincoln, September 22, 1862.

† See footnote, p. 113.

“ROCHDALE, Jany. 30, '63.

“*Dear Sir* :—It is possible I may come down to see you to-morrow morning if I can arrange it.

“If I come I shall hope to see you between 10 and 12 o'clock—I must return in the course of the afternoon.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., Liverpool.”

“Private.

“ROCHDALE, April 23, '63.

“*My Dear Sir* :—Thank you for the pamphlet. It makes me very angry to read the cases of the *Alabama* and the *Maurry*.

“I think Lord Russell will go on with the proceedings against the *Alexandra*. Our Govt. is so much in favor of belligerents that it cannot disregard those international obligations to which it attaches so much importance.

“They find it very difficult for the same reason to say anything against the seizures made by your vessels. The owner of the *Peterhoff** told me that she was not a blockade runner, and had no contraband of war on board. I hope if this be so, your prize court will soon liberate her. It will be a great misfortune if any trouble arises out of any of the recent seizures.

“There is a special hostility to your Commodore or Admiral Wilkes and he should be careful to keep within the law. I cannot be in the House on Friday night. I am kept here at present by domestic affairs and must leave the public to its fate.

“There seems an increasing emigration to the States just now. Can you tell me if an emigrant is, immediately on landing liable to the conscription, or only after a certain time of residence? Two men have just come back here fearing the draft, and I suppose many are deterred from going by fear of it.

“If your Govt. were to offer a free passage to 50,000 people from Lancashire, I think they might get them—they would be avenged on the cap-

* The case of the *Peterhoff* is related in detail in *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia* for 1863 under “Prize.” She was captured by a United States vessel February 25, 1863, off the Island of St. Thomas. Upon her bills of lading she was bound “for off the Rio Grande, Gulf of Mexico, to Matamoras.” Her clearance was from London to Matamoras. She left London early in January, 1863. Her registered owner was an English subject. Her cargo was laden by a large number of shippers, all of them British subjects, with the exception of one, who was a citizen of the United States and a resident of Texas at the breaking out of the war, and was a passenger on the vessel. The portion represented by this passenger was more in value than half the whole.

It was shown by the character, of the army stores on board that they were “contraband of war,” that the bills of lading gave a false showing as to the vessel's destination. The ship and entire cargo were therefore confiscated.

italists who have backed the South by making labor scarce and dear hereafter.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“T. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

“[P. S.] I wish I could get a copy of your *Homestead Bill*. I do not know what it is.”

In an eloquent speech delivered at Birmingham, January 26, 1864, on “The Distribution of Land,” recommending emigration to America, Mr. Bright speaks in detail of the Homestead Act, which came into operation 1st January, 1863, and says: “I have a copy of the Act here, and the circular, which was issued from the Department of State, giving direction as to how the Act should be worked throughout the Union” (p. 355, Rogers’ Ed. of *Bright’s Speeches*, 1868).

“ROCHDALE, April 27, ’63.

“*My Dear Sir* :—Thank you for the Homestead Bill, &c. The Documents are very interesting.

“The *Charleston* business is bad as was to be expected. It appears to me that half a dozen people in your Govt. do as they like—trying to do too much and failing almost in all. If the Iron clads had been on the great river, perhaps they might have cleared it by this time—whereas neither one thing nor the other is done—I am afraid Banks is not up to his work at New Orleans—the whole power of the South is evidently in arms, all its force is given up to the war and therefore the contest is doubtful.

“The speeches of Palmerston and the Solicitor General have given offense—naturally enough—I hope the seizure of the *Alexandra* will improve the tone in the States. In the debate on Friday last, the Govt. were mild enough, and Mr. Cobden’s speech was excellent. It must do much good here.

“I am sorry for your ‘heart sickness’—perhaps the clouds will break.

“I am always in trouble for your country—and whilst the contest lasts, I seem able to think of nothing else.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

“ROCHDALE, July 9, ’63.

“*Dear Sir* :—I am not likely to be in town for some days—but I have sent your note and the extracts to Mr. Cobden and have urged him to see

some of the members of the Govt. with a view to measures to stop the iron-plated ships. I did what I could before I left London. Affairs in the States are very critical. There seems a strange want of foresight and of force at Washington and I fear this has bred *disgust* and *hopelessness* among the People.

“Why pay and fight under Leaders totally incompetent to lead and win? Is not this a possible feeling?”

“Again, has the Slavery poison gone so deep as to have polluted and enfeebled the free States that they cannot subdue the revolution which threatens to destroy them?”

“History may answer this question—I cannot.

“I have kept my faith till now—and I shall not part with it except as I should part with my life’s hope.

“Perhaps another week or two may bring better tidings—I will hope still.

“Yours very Sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consulate,
Liverpool.”

Among the curious miscellaneous correspondence of Mr. Dudley relating to his consulate at Liverpool during the war of the rebellion, were a large number of letters from persons who stated they desired to enlist in the service of the United States. They were sometimes very descriptive of the applicant and often original and amusing, showing considerable egotism and conceit. Many of these were undoubtedly written in good faith, while others were most likely written by spies and those who wished to entrap the American Consul in an offense against the laws of Great Britain. Most appear to have been written by Irishmen whose animosity to England is quite evident, and some were from those who had no real intention of joining the army of the United States, but desired to use this method as a means to obtain a free passage.

We regret that we have not space to give a few of these to show the variety of men the American Consul had to deal with. They have an historic interest as a picture of the times.

Many of these letters being from men then in Lancashire where the operatives were starving through the shutting off of the cotton supply for the mills by the blockade, will bring to mind the passage in one of the above letters of John Bright to Mr. Dudley, April 22, 1863, where he says: “If your Govt. were to offer a free passage to 50,000 people from Lancashire, I think they might get them.”

Mr. Dudley was constantly subjected to insults and threatening letters, sneers, and social evidences with the plainest remarks of hatred for him as the representative of the United States. The flag at the consulate was often found with tin kettles and bricks tied to it as an object of contempt. On one occasion it is believed personal violence was intended in an assault

at his own house. Three men apparently bent on mischief rang his door bell, and were so stern in their demands to see Mr. Dudley, that the servant was in an agony of fear, but taking in the situation at a glance the Consul, with prompt presence of mind, quickly shut the door in their faces and bolted it. It is believed they were armed and intended assaulting him. His duties were therefore for the most part entirely new and without precedent, requiring just such a man of more than usual executive ability, promptness, and decision of character, not open to blandishments or bribes.

In the biographical notices which appeared at the time of his death much has been said about his patriotic action in preventing the sailing of the numerous vessels fitted out, not only at Liverpool, but elsewhere, to prey upon American commerce. These general statements give no idea of the character of the work and its arduous as well as dangerous difficulties, in all its intricate details in which Mr. Dudley faithfully served his country. To say that he was a sentinel at the most advanced outpost, and in the midst of the enemy's country; while it gives an idea of his constant watchfulness, barely shows his actual encounter with the enemy. Of the long list of vessels, 324 blockade steamers reported by Mr. Dudley, 126 were either captured, sunk or battered to pieces. The mere mention of their names alone with that of fifty-six sailing vessels engaged in the same piratical enterprise, fill a column and a half in an ordinary sized newspaper. The source from which this is taken gives some valuable details regarding twelve war steamers, which Mr. Dudley also reported and was instrumental either in stopping, or embarrassing so effectually that except in one or two instances, comparatively little harm was accomplished. It was here that Mr. Dudley's legal services were continually employed. He was obliged to be constantly before the English officials with a mass of sworn evidence in regard to the hostile character and destination of these vessels, obtained as best he could in a neighborhood where every obstruction was put in his way, and spies constantly employed to watch his slightest movements, and many who were willing to testify were deterred by the fear of social ostracism and loss of business. Citations to appear were sent to him at the most inconvenient times. He was obliged in self-defense and in the service of his country to fight these persistent people with their own weapons. By the authority of the President he had over one hundred spies employed, and to guard against deception, many of these were spies upon each other, not a single one knew the name or identity of a brother spy. Mr. Dudley himself traveled *incognito* through the country, and for three years there was not a keel laid in Great Britain, without his learning the whole particulars within twenty-four hours.

Impressed with his work, the President gave him extraordinary powers and every consulate in Great Britain, with the exception of the single one in London, was placed under his supervision. Even many of the American Consuls on the continent, who were not under his jurisdiction, repeatedly

wrote to him for advice and instructions, in the new and trying situation they found the rebellion had placed them. The mass of correspondence alone, without mentioning the other work which this situation occasioned, is evidenced by a simple statement of the fact. The following interesting letter to Mr. Dudley from Captain Winslow, of the *Kearsarge*, describing the combat with the *Alabama*, was a fulfillment of the hopes of the little band of patriots resident in Liverpool, as well as of the American people. The engagement took place on June the 19th :

“ U.S. KEARSARGE, CHERBOUR, June 24, '64.

“ *My Dear Sir* :—Your letter conveying congratulations with many of the same kind has been received. I thank you in behalf of my crew and officers, for this evidence of the estimate you put upon the destruction of the *Alabama*. I think you will ere this reaches you find full particulars in the *Daily News* as Morse and the London Legation have written for them and a *Herald* correspondent has been on board.

“ You know I could not challenge the *Alabama* without violating orders. I however got one from Semmes to wait until he was ready (a quite unnecessary request since he knew that was my business). The *Kearsarge* carried into action 160 men, 7 guns, 2 Dahlgren's eleven inch, 1 light rifle twenty-eight pounder and four thirty-twos. The *Alabama* had eight, one more than the *Kearsarge*, consisting of 100 pounder rifle and heavy sixty-eight ditto, six thirty-two pounder guns. The *Alabama* had the coal bunkers filled, the *Kearsarge* was partly empty and her sides for twenty feet opposite the bunkers were hung with chains, stopped to eye bolts. This was done on board and the chains belonged to the sheet anchors and were put there as a sort of protection when the bunkers were out of coal.

“ The *Kearsarge* steamed several miles seaward to prevent the *Alabama's* getting back and dispose of all questions of jurisdiction. Turning she started for close quarters with the *Alabama* and coming down received three broadsides of the *Alabama*, nearly raking [her] which it was necessary to get, to close in with her. No shot came on deck from this firing. The action lasted one hour and two minutes, when [the] *Alabama* struck, and it was well for her, for she would have been most destructively raked.

“ The *Kearsarge* had some 28 or 29 shot above and below, some 5 or 6 aft mainmast which were the best two shells in her chains on the side which were of no importance. One shot of 100 lbs. in her stern post remaining (bad shot this). The *Deerhound* ran off with prisoners, which I could not believe any cur dog could have been guilty of under the circumstances, hence I did not open on him.

“ We landed of *Alabama*, 63 men, 3 dead, 17 wounded. Have 5 officers prisoners.

“ All twaddle about *Alabama's* firing going down. The vessel they say was a slaughter house, and when some of the men ran aft to prevent

the flags being hauled, Semmes took his pistol to blow out their brains—this is true and don't show there was any disposition to fire guns when sinking.

“We had 3 severely wounded. The *Alabama* has here now 74 men and officers—3 dead, making 77 of the number, 18 are wounded—39 were landed (officers and men) in England, making 116 in all. Of the 116 left about 20 are wounded and they say some 40 lost, killed and went down in the ship. For want of means for providing I was compelled to parole all except officers.

“This is a memorandum of the whole story, which I am sorry from the number of letters I have to answer, that I cannot put in another shape.

“I remain with thanks very truly yours,

“JNO. A. WINSLOW.

“THOS. H. DUDLEY, Esq., U. S. Consul,
Liverpool.”

Mr. J. C. Bancroft Davis, in his recent interesting work, *Mr. Fish and the Alabama Claims; A Chapter in Diplomatic History*, has ably set forth Mr. Sumner's estimate of the damages inflicted on the United States by England, and though we may agree with Mr. Davis in his personal estimate of Sumner's character and ability, and especially that such a statement of damages was undiplomatic and impractical as regards any pending arbitrations, yet nevertheless we must allow that a large body of the American people felt that Mr. Sumner truly stated our wrongs. His was not an overestimate of the importance of these damages which are so far away they seem unreal to the present generation which unquestionably prolonged the war and produced the slaughter of thousands of our countrymen, who died by English bullets fired from English guns for whose death England was responsible.

Mr. Davis, quoting Mr. Sumner's speech in the Senate upon the Johnson-Clarendon Treaty for the settlement of the *Alabama* Claims, says: “Under the heading, ‘The Case Against England,’ he [Sumner] said: ‘At three different stages the British Government is compromised; first, in the concession of ocean belligerency, on which all depended; secondly, in the negligence which allowed the evasion of the ship in order to enter upon the hostile expedition for which she was built, manned, armed and equipped; and thirdly, in the open complicity which, after the evasion, gave her welcome, hospitality and supplies in British ports. Thus her depredations and burnings, making the ocean blaze, all proceeded from England, which by three different acts lighted the torch. To England must be traced the widespread consequences which ensued.’ What those widespread consequences were he set forth in detail under the heading, ‘The Extent of Our Losses.’ He estimated the loss sustained by the capture and burning of American vessels at about \$15,000,000, on the authority of ‘a statistician.’ The loss in the carrying trade he put at \$110,000,000. Then he said that, large as these losses were, there was another chapter

where they were larger far—"the national losses caused by the prolongation of the war and traceable directly to England," and he clinched the statement by saying, 'If through British intervention the war was doubled in duration or in any way extended, as cannot be doubted, then is England justly responsible for the additional expenditure to which our country was doomed;' and he stated the cost of the suppression of the Rebellion at \$4,000,000,000, thus leaving the calculation of this item plain to the youngest schoolboy."

"The feeling of hostility towards our country," Mr. Dudley said, "was not confined to one class, but pervaded all classes, the laboring and middle classes as well as the higher. Of the entire population of England, nine out of every ten sympathized with the slave-holders' Rebellion. I say nine out of every ten, deliberately. I am aware there are those in England who entertain a different opinion, and assert that among the laboring classes of the country the majority were with the North. I do not think so, and am satisfied the proportions I have given are correct. . . ."

"You can now understand how it was that this sympathy should become active and bear fruit in the recognition of belligerent rights to the rebels, in building them a navy, in fitting out cruisers to sweep our commerce from the seas, in furnishing arms and munitions to their army, and supplies to clothe and feed them. You can also understand why one of the leading blockade runners, whilst mainly engaged in the blockade business, was elected Mayor of Liverpool; why John Laird could be elected to Parliament from Birkenhead by an increased majority; and why Sheffield, a leading manufacturing town, trading with the United States, would send Roebuck as their representative.

"The effect of all this was to prolong, to intensify and render more bloody the war. Much of the blood that was spilt, much of the treasure that was spent, are justly chargeable to the Government and people of Europe who recognized the rebels as belligerents and gave them aid and comfort; and to this charge the people of England are especially obnoxious. But for this recognition, the South could not have had a cruiser on the ocean; but for this active aid and sympathy she could not have armed her men, or fed or clothed them when in the field. It was the hope of intervention that buoyed up the South, and cheered them on in the desperate contest. It was this that supplied fuel to the flame and kept the fire burning. But for this, in my judgment, the war could not have lasted for a year; and the probabilities are that the ninety days given by Mr. Seward for its termination would have witnessed the end, as he predicted."*

In 1867, the Government of the United States sent David A. Wells to Europe for the purpose of investigating the questions of production and labor in England, France, Belgium and Germany. Mr. Seward, at the instance of the Secretary of the Treasury, detailed Mr. Dudley to accom-

* See p. 11, *Proceedings at the Dinner Given by the Bar of New Jersey to Thomas H. Dudley, Esq.*, Nov. 25, 1868, Newark.

pany Mr. Wells. Of this appointment he says : "I therefore have been in many of the manufactories of Europe, and had an opportunity to study them and learn the wages and the condition of their working people."*

Returning to this country on a visit in the latter part of 1868, the members of the New Jersey Bar gave a dinner to Mr. Dudley on November 25, at Newark, in recognition of his distinguished services to the country, at which the late Mr. Justice Bradley, of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senators Frelinghuysen and Cattell, Chancellor Zabriskie, Attorney-General Robeson and many eminent persons were present. Mr. Bradley, introducing Mr. Dudley, spoke of him as a Jersey lawyer, whose professional career had ever been marked by the greatest promptness, assiduity and painstaking in the cause of his clients, and whose unfaltering patriotism and sympathy for the principles which on our part lay at the bottom of the struggle, pointed him out as the man to be implicitly trusted. And how well and nobly has he justified the confidence which President Lincoln reposed in him !" Mr. Bradley also enumerated the numerous vessels captured, sunk and detained through his watchfulness.

Mr. Frelinghuysen, on this occasion, spoke of the energy and perseverance with which Mr. Dudley had stood by the interests of his country amid difficulties and discouragements of no ordinary kind and in spite of the social coventry, to which, in company with others from the North, he was contemptuously dispatched during the progress of our civil war. "It is *something*," said he, "to do our duty when it is hard, and incurs the general opprobrium of those around ; and honor should be given to him who faithfully performs his duty under such circumstances."

In 1871, Mr. Dudley proceeded to Geneva to attend the Court of Arbitration there and to assist the Government in regard to the *Alabama*. The English themselves appear to have been impressed with his character while endeavoring to controvert his important testimony concerning the *Florida* in the "Counter Case of Great Britain," at the Geneva Arbitration. We have the following (p. 299) : "The American Consul at Liverpool, whose activity in hunting for secret information appears to have been indefatigable," and again (p. 301), "Mr. Dudley, though he appears to have been an intelligent and painstaking officer," etc. In short we may say that the subject of this sketch possessed that staunch quality which is the admiration of the Anglo-Saxon race all the world over, called "force."

The testimony of another Englishman on another occasion is also worth recording. Mr. James Spence, of the well-known firm of Richardson, Spence & Co., a citizen of Liverpool, said of Mr. Dudley : "My acquaintance with him commenced when he first came to Liverpool, and our friendship, I am happy to say, never varied. He filled a very responsible and onerous position in most troublesome times, with much prudence and discretion with credit to himself, and benefit to his Government."

* P. 19, *Specch at Astoria, N. Y.*, Oct. 23, 1884.

In 1872, after his service at Geneva, he was appointed Assistant Attorney-General of the United States to settle certain claims against the Government.

The Consulate of Liverpool, being both famous and lucrative, was eagerly sought even during his incumbency, but no pressure of the many office-seekers could induce the Government to remove him, he was too valuable a man for the place. At the time of his voluntary resignation in 1872, it is said there were no less than fifteen hundred applicants for the position. He had before repeatedly desired to resign when the war was over, but was told, by Mr. Seward, his services could not be spared, and begged to remain.

These are but a few of the incidents of national importance which occurred during his long sojourn of eleven years as Consul at Liverpool; they were closely interwoven with the history of his active life. Of minor importance were the opportunities the position gave him for social intercourse with his grateful countrymen, many of whom of the most distinguished character he entertained at his own house in Liverpool, of his frequent travels on the continent, and during this time his careful observation and study on the Tariff question gave him excellent and well-digested material for his numerous pamphlets on the subject written on his return, which are given in the bibliography below. These were widely circulated throughout the country. We wish to call attention to three of considerable political interest; that written in Liverpool, the case of the *Alabama* contrasted with that of the *Maury* at New York during the Crimean War, which pamphlet excited John Bright's just indignation;* the able reply to Augustus Mongredien's pamphlet† on the Tariff, which passed through many editions, and was in one especially commended by a letter from Peter Cooper, and the last paper which he wrote, *The Three Critical Periods in Our Diplomatic Relations with England During the Late War*. This is different in style and subject from the others, a

* In his *Three Critical Periods in Our Diplomatic Relations with England During the Late War*, Mr. Dudley (p. 17) says: "During the Crimean War in 1855, Mr. Barclay, the English Consul at New York, wrote Mr. Crampton, the English Minister at Washington, that he had reason to believe that the barque *Maury* was being fitted out in New York as a cruiser for Russia against England. Mr. Crampton wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr. Marcy, and he communicated with Mr. Cushing, the Attorney-General, who directed the United States District Attorney at New York to take immediate steps for the detention of the vessel, and this was done. In 1838, during the Canadian Rebellion, the United States, at the instance of England, passed a special Act of Congress to prevent our people from aiding the Rebellion. I prepared a pamphlet, containing the correspondence in the case of the *Alabama* and the barque *Maury*, and the special Act of Congress just referred to, to show the difference between the United States and England in enforcement of neutrality. I sent a copy of this pamphlet to all the members of the House of Commons, the leading members of the House of Lords and many of the prominent people in the kingdom. The English Government, in a dispatch dated September 25, 1863, addressed to Mr. Adams, refused to pass a new law to preserve its neutrality."

† The *Western Farmer of America*, by Augustus Mongredien, author of *Free Trade and English Commerce*. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., London, Paris and New York. All rights reserved, 1880. 12mo, pp. 30. The second title page has the seal of the Cobden Club.

deeply interesting narrative from which a much better idea can be obtained of his career abroad than in any words we can give. It is a paper of ability in its department, equal though different from the others, and gives rise to a melancholy regret, that one who could write so well had not completed his story before death called him away.

On his return to his native country, in 1872, he purchased an estate, "The Grange," near Camden, and built a handsome house upon it. Here were frequently entertained perhaps the most distinguished company of men ever gathered together in West Jersey. General Grant, while President, with his family, also passed the day there on one occasion.

In "The Report of the New Jersey Commissioners on the Centennial Exhibition," * it is said of Mr. Dudley, who had been appointed on the Board of Finance in 1873, that he represented New Jersey "with great assiduity and ability." This important office was one which required constant attention for several years.

From this time he was actively engaged as President of the Agricultural Society of New Jersey; President of the Pittsburgh, Titusville & Buffalo Railroad, and of the New Jersey Mining Company; a Director in the Camden & Atlantic Railroad, the West Jersey Railroad, the Camden & Philadelphia Ferry Company, and of the Peoples Gaslight Company of Jersey City; first Vice-President of the American Protective Tariff League, etc., and President of the Bar Association of Camden.

On March 22, 1886, he was elected to membership in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. In the American Philosophical Society he was a member of the Council in the years 1887, 1890, and 1893, also serving on numerous committees. In these two societies he was an active member and must have held membership in others which are unknown to us.

In short, his activity towards the end of a life of earnest work from his early youth, at a period when most men begin to show signs of age, was remarkable. During this time he wrote the numerous pamphlets whose titles we have given, and articles for the newspapers, besides taking part in political campaigns, making many speeches in his own State, in Pennsylvania, New York and Virginia, in behalf of the Republicans.

His death, in the seventy-third year of his age, was most unexpected and sudden. He was in such good health that he accepted an invitation to respond to a toast to be given on April the 25th to the Minister to Germany. A few days previous, seemingly strong and vigorous, early in the morning of April 15, 1893, arriving at the Broad Street Station, in Philadelphia, he died almost instantly from an attack of heart failure. He was buried at Colestown Cemetery, near Moorestown, where repose the remains of his wife and infant son and of many of his old friends and neighbors. This spot was his own choice, for he was greatly attached to early associations, which seemed strengthened by a long absence from home and a participation in stirring scenes abroad. The

* Trenton, 1877, p. 41.

Grand Army of the Republic of this district asked permission to place the flag upon his grave and to decorate it with flowers on Decoration Day, for they said he had served his country as faithfully as a soldier.

The immense fleet of vessels carrying arms and munitions of war which, through his instrumentality, were stopped or rendered harmless, and the fifteen million of the *Alabama* claims acquired largely through his vigilance and prompt evidence, and information of great value conveyed to the home Government, make his claims on his country's gratitude equal to those of a great general.

To sum up his personality, "Every one," says Cervantes, "is the son of his own work." His face, full of energy and decision, bore the impress of his life. In person he was tall, in dress and habits simple.

One of Mr. Dudley's biographers* gives a truthful account of some of his traits in the following: "Deeply religious in the Quaker sense, which makes each man alone responsible to his Maker and not to conventional ceremony, he was more spiritual minded than a practical prosaic lawyer and man of affairs would be taken to be, but never wore his heart upon his sleeve save to familiars. Hated by many through the prejudice and misconception engendered in political strife [as strong characters often are], misunderstood by many more because he would not stoop to conquer, he pursued the even tenor of his way in the respect and love of his confidants. Rarely heading public subscriptions, he was instant in good ways and works, and most of his generous benefactions were only known to the needy recipients."

An eminent member of the Bar of New Jersey † who knew him well thus describes him: "He was, as a lawyer, distinguished for the absolute devotion to the cause of his client with which he conducted his cases; no difficulty daunted and no obstacle deterred him. He persevered with indomitable energy and unceasing assiduity until his object was attained."

We close this sketch with a tribute to the character of Mr. Dudley from one for whose sound judgment we have the highest respect—the venerable Frederick Fraley, the President of this Society.

"NO. 1000 WALNUT ST., SEPT. 27, 1893.

"*My Dear Sir* :—I owe you an apology for not writing a reply to your letter relative to my acquaintance and friendship with our mutual friend Dudley.

"I find by reference to the minutes of the Centennial Board of Finance that he was elected a Director of that body in December, 1873. I then became personally acquainted with him, although I had known him by reputation as a great and useful man during our unhappy Civil War. My intercourse with him from 1873 until the date of his death was characterized by frequently meeting with him, participating in the work of the Centennial, and in many ways making our friendship of the strongest kind.

* H. L. Bonsall, in *The Post*, a daily paper of Camden, April 15, 1893.

† Mr. Samuel H. Grey.

"I had learned a great deal from him of the thrilling events which took place during his holding the Consular office in England, and I also had opportunities for testing the value and extent of the information he possessed of economic and business questions. His death was a severe blow to me, and unexpectedly severed the ties which had bound us together for nearly twenty years.

"He spent a morning with me and my family a few days before his death, and we were all wonderfully impressed with his kindly manners and the interest which he gave on that occasion to our Sunday morning gathering.

"This made for him with us a glorious sunset for such a life, and I am truly thankful that I was permitted to have such a friend.

"Sincerely yours,

"FREDERICK FRALEY.

"WM. JOHN POTTS, Esq.,
Camden, N. J."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Correspondence Respecting the *Alabama*, also Respecting the Bark *Moury*, at New York, During the Crimean War; and The Temporary Act of Congress Passed by the United States at the Instance of Great Britain, in 1833, to Meet the Case of the Rebellion in Canada. [1862.] 12mo, pp. 56. (This contains several letters by Mr Dudley and others relating to the *Alabama's* history which are extremely important.)
2. Proceedings at the Dinner Given by the Bar of New Jersey to Thomas H. Dudley, Esq., November 25, 1868. Newark · Printed at the *Daily Advertiser* Office, 1868. 8vo, pp. 18. (This contains the speech of Mr. Dudley, etc. See pp. 4 to 16, inclusive.)
3. Protective Tariff and Free Trade. By Hon. Thomas H. Dudley (late United States Consul to Liverpool). Printed by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, 1880. 12mo, pp. 13. (Apparently the first edition. This is in the form of a letter to "Charles Edwin [*sic*] Rawlins, Esq., Liverpool," dated "Camden, N. J., January 20, 1830.")
4. Protection or Free Trade for the United States of America? Discussed in Two Letters between the Hon. Thomas H. Dudley, Ex-United States Consul to Liverpool, and Charles Ed. Rawlins, an Ex-President of the Chamber of Commerce, Liverpool. *Audi alteram partem*. Second Edition, 1880. 12mo, pp. 29. The Argus Printing and Stationery Company, Limited, 31 Dale Street, Liverpool.
5. Please Read and Circulate. Reply to Augustus Mongredien's Appeal to the Western Farmer of America, Showing the Prosperity of America under Protection and the Decline of England under Her So-called Free Trade System. By Hon. Thomas H. Dudley (late

- United States Consul at Liverpool). 12mo, pp. 48. Printed by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, 1880.
6. *Tariff Tract No. 12, 1880.* Published by the American Iron and Steel Association at No. 265 South Fourth street, Philadelphia, at which place copies of this tract may be had free, for distribution, on application by letter.
 - Protection to Home Industry. Shall England Interfere in Our Elections and Make Our Tariff Laws for Her Benefit? Reply to Augustus Mongredien's Appeal to the Western Farmer of America.* By the Hon. Thomas H. Dudley, of Camden, N. J. (late United States Consul to Liverpool). 8vo, pp. 24. (Appears to be a reprint of No. 5.)
 7. *Errors and Appeals. Edward Dudley vs. Camden and Philadelphia Steamboat Ferry Company, in Error, Etc.* Thomas H. Dudley, Counsel. 12mo, pp. 18. (One of the so-called "paper books," printed in 1882, probably.)
 8. *Court of Errors and Appeals. Benjamin F. Davis vs. the Township of Delaware, in Error. Brief of Plaintiff in Error.* Thomas H. Dudley of Counsel for Plaintiff in Error. [No date.] 12mo, pp. 16. ("Paper book.")
 9. *The Farmer Feedeth All. How Protection Affects the Farmer. An Address Delivered before the New Jersey State Agricultural Society, at Waverley, September 22, 1882.* By Hon. Thomas H. Dudley, Philadelphia. Allen, Lane & Scott's Printing House, Nos. 229-231 South Fifth Street [Phila.], 1882. 8vo, pp. 16. (This was also printed by the Republican National Committee, campaign of 1884, Document No. 4.)
 10. *Please Read and Circulate.* Copies may be had by addressing Thomas H. Dudley, Camden, N. J. Reply to Augustus Mongredien's Appeal to the Western Farmer of America, Showing the Prosperity of America under Protection and the Decline of England under Her So-called Free Trade System. By Thomas H. Dudley (late United States Consul at Liverpool). With Peter Cooper's Letter Endorsing the Same. 8vo, pp. 48. Allen, Lane & Scott's Printing House, Nos. 229-231 South Fifth Street [Phila.], 1883. (A note on the second page of the cover says, giving a letter from Peter Cooper, of New York: "This endorsement of Mr. Cooper's and the pamphlet of Mr. Dudley's were published in the *Justice*, of New York, and *National Farmer*, of Washington.")
 11. *A Reply to Kersey Graves' Comparison between Protection and Free Trade in the United States.* By Thomas H. Dudley (late United States Consul at Liverpool). [1883.] 8vo, pp. 11.
 12. *An Address Delivered Before the New Jersey Board of Agriculture, February 6, 1883.* By Thomas H. Dudley, President. Printed by Order of the Board of Agriculture, Camden, N. J. 8vo, pp. 16. The Milliette Printing Rooms, No. 21 Federal Street.

13. The Cobden Club of England and Protection in the United States. A Speech Made at a Republican Meeting Held at Astoria, New York, October 23, 1884. By Thomas H. Dudley, of Camden, N. J. (late United States Consul at Liverpool, England.) 8vo, pp. 32.
14. Competition of India Wheat; Cause of Decline in Price; to Supercede American in English Market. The Remedy. From Address Before the State Board of Agriculture of New Jersey, February 3, 1885. By Thomas H. Dudley, President (late Consul at Liverpool). 8vo, pp. 14. Camden, N. J.: S. Chew, Printer, Front and Market Streets, 1885.
15. Address of Thomas H. Dudley, President of the State Board of Agriculture. Delivered before said Board at Trenton, February 2, 1886. 8vo, pp. 16. Camden, N. J.: S. Chew, Printer, Front and Market Streets, 1886.
16. Is There Reciprocity in Trade? And the Consumption of Manufactured Commodities. By Thomas H. Dudley. Read before the American Philosophical Society, October 1, 1886. 8vo, pp. 9.
17. Which is Best for the Farmers, Protection or Free Trade? An Address before the Agricultural Society of Lancaster County, Delivered at Lancaster City, Pa., February 7, 1887. By Thomas H. Dudley, of Camden, N. J. Answer to Col. Beverley, of Virginia, and Hon. Frank Hurd, of Ohio. 8vo, pp. 24. (Issued by the American Protective Tariff League.)
18. The Farmers and the Tariff. A Speech Delivered at the Meeting of the Farmers' Congress at Chicago, November 11, 1887. By Thomas H. Dudley, of Camden, N. J. 8vo, pp. 16. Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott's Printing House, . . . 1887. (Reprinted as a campaign document in the *Defender*, New York, July 2, 1892.)
19. How Abraham Lincoln was Nominated. An Article in the *Century Magazine* for July, 1890. Reprinted in *The Bulletin of the American Iron and Steel Association*, Philadelphia, July 16, 1890, No. 26.
20. Letter on Agriculture as Affected by the Tariff. *North American Review*. pp. 2.
21. What is Protection? Symposium for a New York paper. Signed at the end, Thomas H. Dudley, Camden, August 30, 1890. 12mo, pp. 2.
22. A Comparison between England under Free Trade and the United States under Protection. By Thomas H. Dudley (late United States Consul at Liverpool). 8vo, pp. 8. Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott's Printing House, 1892.
23. Three Critical Periods in Our Diplomatic Relations with England During the Late War. Personal Recollections of Thomas H. Dudley, Late United States Consul at Liverpool. Reprinted from the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, April, 1893. 8vo, pp. 22.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

The following valuable letter was received to-day (May 16), too late for insertion in the foregoing, and as it forms an historical paper of especial interest, written by one of the last three survivors of the Emancipation Society of Liverpool's Committee of Twenty-five, the Honorary Secretary Col. Robert Trimble, now of Taranaki, New Zealand, who has been a member of Parliament there, and has held numerous political offices, it is an excellent supplement to the foregoing. The letter is addressed to Mr. Thomas H. Dudley's sister-in-law, Miss Matlack.

Col. Trimble was the author of several pamphlets explaining and sympathizing with the action of the North, which we give in a footnote.*

W. J. P.

“INGLEWOOD, TARANAKI, NEW ZEALAND, April 18, 1895.

“*My Dear Miss Matlack*:—Mrs. Trimble has passed to me your letter of February 24 to be answered. I need hardly say that I am glad that Mr. Dudley is to have a fitting biography. Upon it could be grafted a whole history of the exterior attitude of the United States. The work passed over to Mr. Dudley was to all appearances overwhelming, and was without precedent for guidance. It looked many a time as if he would break down, so heavy were the odds. A passionate love for his country, and a temper singularly equable, carried him over or around all his difficulties.

“I now, in accordance with your request, send you a few memories of men and movements, looking tame enough now, after the lapse of over thirty years, but once instinct with life and redolent of human hopes. Nor was fear wanting. During the great epic struggle between the powers of light and of darkness there were times when it almost seemed as if the darkness had won. Hence we used to say, ‘We do not say the North shall win, but we say it ought to win.’

“Never during the tempest did Mr. Dudley despair of the State. The news was sometimes cruelly bad, but he always carried a head erect and a heart undaunted.

* *Slavery in the United States of America*. A Lecture delivered in Liverpool, December, 1861, by Robert Trimble.

The Negro North and South. The Status of the Coloured Population in the Northern and Southern States of America Compared. By Robert Trimble.

Popular Fallacies Relating to the American Question. A Lecture delivered in November, 1863, by Robert Trimble. 12mo, pp. 36.

A Review of the American Struggle in the Military and Political Aspects, from the inauguration of President Lincoln, 4th March, 1861, till his reelection, 8th November, 1864. By Robert Trimble. 12mo, pp. 48.

The Present Crisis in America, by Robert Trimble. 1865. 12mo, pp. 10.

These pamphlets were printed, London: Whittaker & Co.; Liverpool: Henry Young; Manchester: Abel Heywood & Son.

“I will now proceed with my discursive narrative. Previous to President Lincoln’s Proclamation in favour of certain forms of Emancipation, which was to take effect on first of January, 1863, there was a very general feeling throughout England that the war between North and South was not likely to issue in the abolition of slavery, if the North proved victorious. The British people are not, as a rule, well informed upon matters taking place abroad, and are therefore at times liable to make serious mistakes. When the Southern partizans proclaimed that their object was to get rid of the Protective System in the Tariff; and the Northern orators and writers kept dinning that the sole object of the North was to keep intact the Union, the people of this country were dazed. They could not understand the nice distinctions of lawyers as to what was Constitutional and what was not. When it was argued that the whole tendency of the war made for freedom, and at the same time, that the authorities could not constitutionally enact emancipation by a vote of Congress, a shrug of the shoulder sufficiently showed incredulity. When, however, President Lincoln issued the Proclamation above referred to, it had an instantaneous effect, and the friends of the United States were able to speak and write with a confidence they never before had experienced. It is true that in the north of England, and particularly in Lancashire, there was a strong feeling that the action of our government should in no way be twisted into a support of the Slave States; and from the time of the sailing of the *Alabama*, in August, 1862, this feeling rapidly assumed a definite shape. When, therefore, the President’s Proclamation reached England the friends of Emancipation saw that the time for united action had come. This was recognized in Manchester sooner than in Liverpool, and this was natural, for Manchester was filled with workingmen who had proved by their conduct all through the struggle that they held that man was not to live by bread alone. In the midst of want they stood firmly by their convictions. In Liverpool, on the other hand, the cotton trade was predominant. Men ‘on change’ were unmistakably ‘Southern’ in their proclivities, that is, the majority of them. The mere rabble took the same side. All that these could understand was that whereas they formerly earned a comfortable living in handling imported cotton, they were now idlers living on the rates, or depending upon very precarious employment. To them ‘cotton’ was still ‘king.’ The Emancipationists in Manchester had the masses to aid them, and they therefore took action first, by establishing an Emancipation Society. In Liverpool the rich and the lowest were acting together, whilst the great body of shopkeepers and the handicraftsmen were favorable to the North. Of course these classifications must be taken as only approximately accurate.

“Such was the state of feeling in Liverpool when an advertizement appeared in the newspapers calling a meeting to assemble in the ‘Clarendon Rooms,’ early in the afternoon of the 17th January, 1863. I was present and was surprised to find so many influential merchants in

attendance. Not knowing many of them, I guessed that the South was largely represented, and that not unlikely sympathy with the North would be a minus quantity. The chair was taken by Mr. John Cropper, a man deservedly respected in Liverpool and far beyond, for his deeds of benevolence. I think it was Mr. Robertson Gladstone (elder brother of Mr. William E. Gladstone) that moved the following resolution :

“That in the opinion of this meeting the war now raging in the United States of America originated in the institution of slavery and in the antagonism which that system inevitably presents to the institutions of freedom ; that in the great national crisis now created by the announcement of the Emancipation policy, the Federal Government is entitled to the generous sympathy of every Englishman, and to the moral support which such sympathy always affords ; that to ensure these from the inhabitants of Liverpool it is now deemed advisable, by means of lectures and public discussions, to fully instruct the public mind on the true conditions of the American question, preliminary to a general aggregate meeting for the adoption of an address to President Lincoln.’

“A debate of an interesting character sprung up. Mr. James Spence,* the S of *The Times* and author of *The American Union*, was present, and in eloquent terms denounced the hypocrisy of the North and praised the chivalry of the South. Slavery was pronounced ‘scriptural’ and ‘patriarchal,’ and poor Onesimus was trotted out once more to prove that injustice is the very highest form of justice. He sat down with an air of triumph which I can never forget. Applause was loud and continuous. Before it was over a man that I then only knew by name, but knew intimately ever after, was on his feet waiting for attention. Mr. Spence was a dainty-looking little man, with a pleasant voice and graceful presence. The man about to reply (John Patterson by name) was a burly Ulsterman with loud voice and energetic action. As soon as Mr. Patterson got a hearing he took a little Bible out of his pocket and first addressed himself to the task of answering the Scriptural arguments of Mr. Spence. He made the house ring with denunciations of man-stealers and of oppressors of the poor. The year of jubilee was not forgotten—in fact, the little pocket-Bible had the effect of a gigantic bomb-shell. Neither before nor since have I heard so able an *ex tempore* rejoinder. There was no occasion for further discussion. The resolution was put and carried almost unanimously. An Emancipation Society was founded and a committee formed to carry out the objects of the resolution. On the motion of our old friend, Mr. C. E. Rawlins, I was asked to be Honorary Secretary, and thus came my official connection with the Society which lasted till the end of the war.

“As you wish to know the names of those most active amongst us, I give

* [A different person from the James Spence of the firm of Spence, Richardson & Co., of Liverpool, whom we have mentioned elsewhere in the foregoing article, a strong friend of the United States.—W. J. P.]

the names of the Committee as follows, reserving a few words to be said about two or three of them afterwards :

Rev. J. S. Jones,	Mr. John Turner,
“ Hugh S. Brown,	“ T. R. Arnott,
“ Charles M. Birrell,	“ Peter Stuart,
“ John Robberds,	“ David Stuart,
Mr. John Cropper,	“ George Golding,
“ I. B. Cooke,	“ Robert Varty,
“ Denis Duly,	“ Andrew Leighton,
“ Robertson Gladstone,	“ E. K. Muspratt,
“ James R. Jeffery,	“ Maurice Williams,
“ John Patterson,	“ William McGowan,
“ Charles E. Rawlins,	“ Charles Wilson,
“ Charles Robertson,	“ Robert Trimble.
“ Richard Sheil,	

“ Besides the above named there were many others that both worked hard and subscribed liberally to our objects, such as the late William Crosfield and his two sons, Thomas Ellison, S. Bully, etc.

“ The committee lost no time in beginning its work. In every district of the town meetings were held preparatory to a great central demonstration at the Amphitheatre. We were followed everywhere by paid organizers of disorder; but notwithstanding this opposition we carried our resolutions at every meeting, including that at Birkenhead.

“ On Thursday evening, 19th of February, we held a great meeting at the Amphitheatre, where we had much organized opposition; but all our resolutions were carried. We had many other occasions for demonstrations and plenty of private work. It is a remarkable fact that our opponents never had a public meeting from the opening of the war till the end.

“ Perhaps I ought to say something of the meeting to hear Mr. Beecher; but the truth is I had no faith in its success, and although we carried our resolutions by overwhelming majorities, yet I think it did us no good. He did not understand his audience, and was too ‘bumptious.’

“ You ask about garments made for the fugitive negroes by my wife and other ladies. I have no particulars of the work done. I have a memorandum written on one of my pamphlets showing the final result of the efforts for the Freedmen and I have the original subscription list somewhere. I saw it quite recently amongst some papers, but for the moment cannot find it. The figures are :

Cash subscriptions.....	£2170	2s.	0d.
Computed value of clothing.....	362	19	9
Total	£2533	1s.	9d.

“After the war closed I thought we might get up a fund of £10,000, but on the advice of Mr. Dudley I dropped the idea. Some time afterwards a gentleman called upon me one morning with a note from his father enclosing £50 to be given to certain American travelers if I thought well of it. The son said that if I thought it desirable, his firm would give £1000 to begin a subscription worthy of the town. I sent once more to Mr. Dudley, giving him in confidence the name. After mature thought, he again gave an opinion similar to that he had given before. Neither of these gentlemen had joined our agitation.

“With regard to Mr. Dudley’s eleven years’ work in Liverpool, I would like to say that I had the good fortune to enjoy his friendship from the middle of the war until he resigned his office of Consul, and can say that he was an indefatigable worker, though all the time labouring under great physical disabilities. He kept a strict watch upon the enemies of the United States, and at the same time was urbane to all who had any business at the consulate. When the full history of that revolutionary period comes to be written his name will be found amongst the most honourable.

“A life perhaps too busy has prevented me from keeping documents concerning passing events, but what I have here written is from memory aided by some odds and ends and preserved letters. I have purposely abstained writing about war ships, blockade runners, confederate bonds and so on, as, if I began, it would require volumes to finish the story. In hunting through old papers in the last few days I find I have still a pretty complete set of my letters exposing the celebrated cotton loan. I am glad to think that the eventual sufferers were not unwarned both from the commercial and the moral side.

“My pamphlets are out of print, so I cannot send you a set, but I find I have a few copies of the three latest and I send you two of each of them.

“You ask for a few incidents which might prove interesting. I have given you one about our old friend, John Patterson, but now recall his name to say that he kept full reports of every meeting held, and all published correspondence that he noticed. I dare say his family has them.

“Charles E. Rawlins wrote the best book brought out amongst us. It is called *American Disunion*. It was published in April, 1862. It has only one fault. He shows himself quite too charitably disposed to his opponents; but that was his constant characteristic. You may have the book in your library.

“Thomas Ellison, a cotton broker, wrote a book called *Slavery and Secession*. It was published just before that by Mr. Rawlins.

“The Rev. J. S. Jones was remarkable for his broad sympathies. He was very ‘high church’ in his views, but he visited, preached in, and lived in the vilest part of Liverpool, and at a nominal salary. I believe he has now similar surroundings in London. He stood second to none amongst our friends.

“The Rev. Charles M. Birrell was a leading Baptist minister, and joined us on account of the moral aspect of the question at issue. He

spoke at our Amphitheatre meeting. He was a very retiring man, but he was roused to vehemence when the mob tried to howl him down. I can never forget the close of his speech. He said that in the old anti-slavery agitations he had stood in the same place and had to face a similar hostile multitude; and then rising to his full height, his face aglow, and lifting his right hand towards heaven, he said, 'We conquered then and we will conquer now.' He touched a chord that vibrated throughout the vast assembly.

"A word or two about Charles Wilson, and I have done. He was a veritable 'Fighting Quaker,' if ever there was one.

"He was Chairman of our Executive Committee, and to him was largely owing the aggressive attitude assumed at the beginning and continued till peace was proclaimed. With all this never man could be more reckoned upon to keep his temper. His services to the cause were beyond praise.

"Perhaps it looks a little insidious to pick out a few, out of many friends, for special mention; but these were serviceable above measure.

"Of the twenty-five members of the committee as already given in list, I believe twenty-two have gone to their rest—their work done. I believe I am right in stating that Messrs. Jones, Muspratt and I, are the last survivors; and of Mr. Jones, I am not quite sure as it is a dozen years since I have heard of him.

* * * * *

"I remain, my dear Miss Matlack,

"Yours sincerely,

"ROBERT TRIMBLE.

"MISS MATLACK, The Grange,
Camden, N. J."